UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

The World We Live In

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part II Chapter V. By M. K. GANDHI

Hinduism and Christianity

By V. V. OAK

Early Autumn

By H. S. N.

VOLUME XCVIII NUMBER 7

Chicago, October 18, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Announcement

Part II

OF GANDHI'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

began in this magazine on

September 20th

GANDHI'S RETURN TO INDIA
HIS LAW PRACTISE
BEGINNING OF HIS PUBLIC CAREER
and
THE GREAT STORY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Subscribe Now! *Renew Now!*

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sirs: Enclosed please find $3.00, for which
(a) Enter my subscription for one year from date, or
(b) Renew my subscription for one year from date of expiration.

Name .....

Address .....

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 99
The World We Live In — JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 101
Jottings—J. H. H.....102
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—SYDNEY STRONG 103
ARTICLES—
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part II, Chapter V—Preparing for South Africa—M. K. GANDHI.....105
Hinduism and Christianity—V. V. OAK.....106
Early Autumn—H. S. N.....107
Bearing One Another's Burdens—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 109
POETRY—
Mahatma Gandhi—*Ellen Chater*..... 99
Sonnet—LILIAN KUENSTER 105
In a Mountain Forest—DOMBEY SHEPHERD....108
Sea Diamonds—MARGUERITE EMILIO.....112
CORRESPONDENCE—
In Reply to Mr. Chworowsky:
I. L. P. JUVET.....110
II. PARKER D. KING.....110
The Next Step Toward Peace—HENRY W. PINKHAM 110
Great Encouragement—P. 110
A Card of Thanks—E. H.....110
THE FIELD
The Next Thing to Do.....111
Expense of War Preparations.....112
To Voters—*Lincoln* 112

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVIII MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1926 NUMBER 7

MAHATMA GANDHI

(To Romain Rolland)

If I could scrawl a great zig-zag of stars
Against the dark, I would write "Gandhi." Then
We might look up where like young Avatars
Above our dust bright planets sing to men
Words written plainly on our own hearts' pages—
(But them we keep unturned, lest God divining
We might go stripped of thirty pence for wages.)
Yet, lifted up to the immaculate shining
Of other worlds, eyes may be clarified.
"He counts the vilest brother. He is meek.
His patience sets men's thoughts where things abide.
He seeks no praise." Thus stars and prophets speak,
There I'd put Gandhi's name and with the faint,
Sweet Pleiades for letters I'd add, "Saint."

The World Tomorrow. —Ellen Chater.

We have a great idea! Yes, we have—a *great idea!!* It has to do with the vexed question of the debt settlements, and is commended to those who so strenuously believe that the Allied debts, more particularly the French debt, should be cancelled. To whom, now, is this French debt owed? Why, to the United States government. Yes—but what does the "government" in this case mean? Why, the people of the United States—or, more particularly in this case, the bond-holders of the United States, the men and women who bought the Liberty and Victory Bonds and thus supplied the money which was lent to France. These persons, during the War, were terribly eager to help France—they "ponied up" their good, hard cash to save her in her dire extremity. But her extremity today is no less dire; she is as hard-pressed as she was on the day when German troops stood upon the banks of the Marne. If she needed help then, she needs it just as much now. Which brings us to our great idea! Let the holders of Liberty and Victory Bonds turn them all in to Washington, and thus cancel the debt which the American government owes them. Then let the United States, thus relieved of this huge indebtedness to its own citizens, turn around and cancel the French debt. Among the reasons most potent for insisting upon payment from France is the fact that what she owes us, we in turn owe to our bond-holders, and that if she doesn't pay us, then our own tax-payers have got to meet this obligation. Here is the chance, now, for these holders of Liberty and Victory Bonds! Let them be magnanimous—let them agree that they didn't lend their money when they bought these bonds, but gave it outright to the great cause of France and the world's peace. They don't want their money back! No, indeed, the debt is canceled! This done, France can be released, and the world saved once again. This is our idea, and we think it truly *great.* We have especial confidence in it because we hold no Liberty Bonds ourselves, and thus are absolutely impartial in the matter.

There is much discussion these days about great powers and small powers. It may be well to ask what constitutes a great power. Referring to recent events at Geneva, the New York *Times* has said (September 17th):

> Brazil with a population of thirty millions, Poland with a population of twenty-seven millions, and Spain with a population of twenty-two millions, and a great historic past, chafed at finding themselves in the same category with the Scandinavian countries, the Balkan nations, Switzerland, and Holland.

It is obvious enough from this statement what the European standard of greatness is. It is the same standard now that it was before the War—population, armaments, military strength, the mailed fist! A great power is a power that can smash its neighbor, to assert its will and win its way. It's the prize fight test of greatness—Dempsey greater than Gandhi! Even "a great historic past" must be measured in terms of brawn. This we had supposed that Holland had "a great historic past"; but no, it is Spain that has a really "great past," because, we suppose, it conquered vast territories, butchered helpless peoples for their gold, and swept small countries, like Holland, with fire and sword. So this is what greatness is, and this is the standard of worth that measures the ranking of nations at Geneva! Brazil, Poland, Spain *"chafed* at finding themselves in the same category with the Scandinavian countries—and Holland"! Well, this is the world we live in, no doubt; and in such a world we see about as much prospect of peace as of summer verdure in the arctic zone. But some day there may be a different world—a world in which Denmark, for example, and Switzerland and Holland will rank greatest among the nations for culture, enlightenment, happiness, and real civilization, and thus be called "great powers." In such a world, and in none other, will peace endure.

Few things have mystified us more than the agitation, recurring in this country every now and then, for the annexation of Canada. The idea that the

Dominion should want to leave the Empire and join the United States is, in the first place, an idea as naive as that of the snail who decided to cross the state highway in the automobile season. But why should the movement start up again and again? We do not know; but we developed a first-class suspicion the other day when we saw an account of what Canada is doing in the field of public ownership. Toronto is running her street railways with a degree of success which puts to shame the record of bankruptcy and public disservice which has been written by the privately owned street railway companies in nearly every city in this land. More important is the great hydro-electric system in Ontario. Here just across the border from the United States, drawing its energy from the same Niagara torrent that feeds the American electric plants in private hands, is a government plant which gives light, heat and power to the people for a mere fraction of what it costs on our side of the frontier. Still more remarkable is the story of the Canadian National Railways. The roads that make up this system were built to develop new territory rather than as immediate dividend makers. For some years, the system lost money and sustained itself by drawing funds from the Canadian treasury. Last year, however, brought the turn of the tide! Though carrying a funded debt of one and a half billions and an annual interest charge of seventy millions, the National Railways last year made a net profit of thirty millions, and returned to the nation the forty millions voted to it. How are such things done? By eliminating capitalization, and substituting service for profits. It is perfectly simple! But if this thing goes on—as it will, because it is so simple—how long can private ownership last in the United States? Ponder that question, and then ask if there isn't a reason for seeking the annexation of Canada.

The story of Dr. Norwood in Toronto, Canada, is interesting. Dr. Norwood, it will be remembered, is the minister of the City Temple, London. During the past summer, he visited this continent on a mission of peace, and, among other places, spoke in Toronto before the ministers' association. In the course of his speech in denunciation of war, he made the statement that more poisonous gases were used by the British than by the Germans, and more tons of lead dropped on defenseless cities by the British than by the Germans, during the War, though both of these violations of international law were made first by the Germans. At the close of the address, a horrified patriot of the cloth arose and asked that Dr. Norwood's remarks concerning Great Britain's use of poisonous gases and bombing of non-combatants be stricken from all press reports, "to protect the name of the Empire." To this Dr. Norwood manfully objected.

> We have too long (he said) regarded ourselves as saints and the others as sinners. War brutalizes all who participate in it, and the sooner that is recognized the sooner will we approach a basis for permanent peace. If the gentlemen of the press want to publish what I said about bombing defenseless cities by British aviators, they have my benediction in doing so. I would even make more sensational statements, if I was seeking for sensation.

Then followed a furious debate as to the accuracy of Dr. Norwood's charges. Could it be possible that British troops had been guilty of atrocities? It seemed impossible, of course, until one of the ministers quietly arose and said:

> I was a member of the Royal Flying Corps, during the war, and I want to bear testimony to what the speaker has asserted. I was one of the men who received orders to drop explosive bombs on defenseless German cities and villages, and I was one of those who did it.

This ended the discussion with a suddenness which was impressive. Is it not time that intelligent men recognized the fact that atrocities were committed on both sides of the battle-front during the War—that war is inevitably and necessarily dirty business—that it is war itself and not the accidents and incidents of war which must be gotten rid of? We believe that Dr. Norwood is engaged in beneficent as well as heroic business in telling the truth about what happened in 1914-1918. His is a patriotic mission in the highest sense of that much-abused word. The sooner we hate ourselves rather than the enemy in this war business—the better.

That is an interesting symposium which is being conducted in London by the *Nation and Athenaeum,* a high-class weekly journal, and the *Daily News,* a popular newspaper. The wide difference in the constituencies of these two publications—the one small and select, the other large and general—makes highly suggestive the answers received to the identical questionnaire sent out to their readers. The questions submitted had to do with the usual problems of God, immortality, the inspiration of the Scriptures, adherence to the Christian faith, etc., etc. Of the *Nation's* readers, fifty-two (52) per cent rejected immortality, sixty (60) per cent expressed flat disbelief in "a personal God," seventy (70) per cent denied the divinity of Christ, seventy-one (71) per cent denied the unique inspiration of the Bible, and forty-eight (48) per cent went so far as to say that they didn't believe in Christianity in any form. Of the readers of the *Daily News,* on the other hand—14,043 replies to date as contrasted with 1,338 answers to the *Nation*—only twenty-eight (28) per cent rejected immortality, twenty-nine (29) per cent showed a disbelief in a personal God, thirty-seven (37) per cent questioned the infallibility of the Bible, and twenty-five (25) per cent rejected Christianity. The extent of positive unbelief in orthodox religion, as thus revealed in this investigation, is amazing. But this bare fact is by no means the most important deduction to be drawn from these data. What is especially impressive is the obvious fact

that as men rise in the scale of intelligence and knowledge, they tend steadily to cast aside the accepted doctrines of the church. The readers of the *Nation* are, on the whole, highly educated men, whereas the readers of the *News* are the average body of men in the street. The difference in mental standards between the two classes may perhaps be roughly measured by the different percentages of their acceptance and rejection of religious tenets. The more men know, in other words, the less they believe. As knowledge filters down, faith seeps out. Here is something that the churches would do well to ponder!

The World We Live In

Do we know the world we live in? If we know the world, do we know the world the other fellow lives in? Or, if there be not many worlds, but only one, do we know the various areas of this one world? Jacob A. Riis wrote his greatest book in "How the Other Half Lives." What about this "other half"—or the smaller fractions that make the "half"?

We chanced, the other day, upon a copy of the *Billboard*—the "Fall Special, August 14, 1926." This magazine, as we soon discovered, was a kind of trade paper for the vaudeville, circus, burlesque, and, in general, lower grades of the theatrical world. It had columns of directories, news, personals, and—"ads"! It was the "ads" that caught and held our attention. On the cover of the magazine was depicted a brilliantly lighted entrance to a theatre, with stylishly dressed men and women flocking in. As we read these "ads," we realized that we had never been a member of this throng—we had never entered this particular place.

Here are animals for sale—all kinds of assortments. The makes especially interested us. Henry Bartels, 72 Cortlandt Street, New York, advertises "tigers—leopards—elephants," and "*Big Snakes* (25 feet long)." We shall have to visit his store some day! But he is outdone by a Kansas City man who has a "*Giant Python,* 26 feet long, *length guaranteed.* This is the largest python imported in many years and is really a giant." We wonder if there is a protective tariff on reptile importations, and, if so, how much! But when we make our purchases, we shall patronize the "Snake King" in Brownsville, Texas. This man has a rock python, only 14 feet long, to be sure, but she has *15 babies*—and the whole family is priced at only $250. That's a small price for all those little fairies in the home.

Next to the animals, the musical machines attracted us. "The Neely Jingle" for dancers, for example! This is "the lightest and best jingle made—it will not clog or catch on splinters." The Saxophone Shop" also sounds attractive. Here, in St. Louis, you can buy all kinds of saxophones, and "everything for the saxophone." In addition, "all broken parts are made just like new." Saxophones, like Fords, evidently lead a strenuous life! We want for our music-room, however, "the Deagan Una-Fon." This is "the BALLY-HOO MUSICAL INSTRUMENT SUPREME. Played same as piano, but with one-fifth the weight, one-tenth the size, yet *fifty times the volume.* We can't wait to play Beethoven's "Moonlight Sonata," or Chopin's "Funeral March," or Liszt's "Liebestraum" on this gorgeous instrument!

Joke books, trick cards, "phoney" coins, posters and pasters innumerable are, of course, advertised on nearly every page. We like especially the delicate humor, the ultra-refinement of "Uncle Josh 'Wise Cracks' for Windshield Stickers." These are the "road jesters of fun-making," as follows—"Peaches, Here's Your Can," "So's Your Old Man," "Thanks For the Huggy Ride," "No One Killed In This Wreck." The man who wrote these screams must be half-brother to the man who writes the new song hits—"So Is Your Old Lady," "Turkish Towel," "Lo-Do, De-O," "Two Ton Tessie," "Nobody's Business," and "I've Found A New Baby." Indeed, genius must be at a premium in this world, as witness the new McNally Bulletin No. 12, "gigantic collection of new, bright and original comedy material—23 screaming monologues, all kinds, including Hebrew, Irish, Nut, Wop, Kid, Temperance, Black and White Face, Female, Tramp, Dutch, and Stump Speech—13 roaring acts for two males—12 original acts for Male and Female—roof-lifting act for two Females—46 monobits—hundreds of crackerjack cross-fire jokes and gags." Only One Dollar per copy: What a gold mine!

Of course the "Want Ads" out-number all the others, and are of infinite variety. In Detroit, Michigan, are wanted "a fat girl, midgets, freaks, or any act for pit shows. Can use a *Good Talker.*" St. Louis wants the "Streets of Cairo," dancers of all nations, sword-dancers, whirling dervishes, flageolet and other weird instrument players, and—"*at least two camels.*" John Francis wants a Feature Dancer—"must have wardrobe, ability and personality." C. R. Leggette wants two good Hawaiian dancers—also "No. 1 Charleston dancer. Must be clever." Barney Hullinger wants "a good organ"; C. A. Wortham, "a monkey speedway—and high-class glass-blower"; and Duke Jeanette, Watertown, N. Y., must have "living skeleton, to work with fat girl."

A special illustrated "ad," on page 167, is so important that we print it in full.

MOONSHINE EDDY

Here is the boy that has no limit. Nothing is more attractive than a toper. Everybody wants to take a crack at him.

No matter if you carry a bottle on your hip (?) you can't pass up this bird. Head continuously wabbles. Holding on to lamp post, with a bottle of hootch. Object is to knock his hat off, and who would not try it? Size of figure, 5 ft. tall. Artistically painted. Made from 2-in. hard wood. Controlled from counter.

Each, $29.50

In this world, plainly enough, drunkenness is an occasion for mirth—at least, from the standpoint of public entertainment It is also a vindication of LIBERTY! Look at this—streamed across the bottom of page 179, one of the most conspicuous advertisements in the paper.

AGENTS WANTED!
To sell this Sign or Hanger. Goes like hot cakes. Big, easy profits to hustlers.

I AM FOR LIGHT WINES AND BEER
LIBERTY FREEDOM
Copyright 1926 by Frank Escudero.

Here is the Revolution—the Declaration of Independence—incidentally "big—easy profits." Not much doubt where these people stand on the liquor question!

And yet—look at this!

WANTED, Real Water Show Clown
Must Be Real Clown and SOBER.
MORRIS & CASTLE SHOWS

And this!

WANTED—SHOW BOAT MAJESTIC

People in all lines, Parts and Specialties. Also Pianist and Dance Team. State age, height and weight, lowest and all in first. Easiest and surest money in business. Six shows a week. Like a vacation. No children, pets or booze. Westport, Ky., August 12, Bethlehem, Ind., 13; Bedford, Ky., 14; Madison, Ind., 15, 16 and 17. Address

T. J. NICHOLS, Manager.

And this!

COLORED PERFORMERS and MUSICIANS WANTED

One good Team, man and wife; must be up in medicine business and change strong for two weeks. Both must sing-dance, man good monolog. One good single Comedian, good, strong Cornet and Trombone Player. No. 1 and No. 2 Shows working close together. If you are a booze head and disorganizer don't answer. These are fourteen-people shows. You must know your stuff and strut it here. Must join on wire. Don't write, but wire. Pay your own and don't misrepresent.

DALTON'S MINSTRELS, Mt. Vernon, Ill.

"Must be—*sober.*" "No children, pets, or BOOZE." *"If you are a booze head*—don't answer." Liquor is all right as a matter of entertainment—of Liberty. But there's no place for it in business! These "ads" are typical. They point, like the compass-needle to the pole, to the world we live in—a world which, with however much confusion and muddle-headedness, is getting rid of drink. It is prohibition on the railroads, prohibition in the factories, prohibition at the steering-wheel of the automobile, prohibition in the circus and on the vaudeville stage, which is going to bring Prohibition in the nation. There are some things which seem to us certain, and this is one of them.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Jottings

Edwin D. Mead, referring to the late President Eliot, speaks of him as having been "the only man in New England in any department of life who could properly be called great." We are astonished that Mr. Mead, in his enthusiasm for President Eliot, should have forgotten President Coolidge. Surely he knows that in Mr. Coolidge we have the greatest president since Washington and Lincoln—nay, a combination of the two. So at least they say in Mr. Mead's own town, Boston!

The real test (on the debt question) ought to be economic—capacity to pay without undue hardship and capacity to receive without undue injury.—*The New Republic.*

It would be a terrible "injury" to this country, wouldn't it, to receive a few of the billions of dollars we lent to Europe during the War? As an humble taxpayer, we think we could survive the "injury."

"Benjamin Franklin—surely he was one of our great men," concedes Professor John Erskine, "but today he would seem—he ought to seem—rather small." Yet he managed to loom large in an age when George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, James Madison, and certain others were alive! Are we really grown so great in our time as all this?

The headlines writer is certainly an artist. See how the genius of the New York *Times* summons "apt alliteration's artful aid"! Thus, describing the Vera Cruz hurricane, he writes—

Water and Wind Wreck Wooden buildings, while Stone Structures Stand Shock.

The *Christian Century* has a splendid slogan—"Make the Debts Win the War." "We lost the war in 1918," it says; not one of the ideals for which we fought was realized. Now, if Europe "will give us what we paid the money to secure, (she) may keep the money." Exactly! This is the *quid pro quo* we have talked so much about in these columns. Cancel the debts outright, unconditionally? Never! Cancel them in return for universal disarmament and the outlawry of war? Yea, verily!

Henry Ford has bought hundreds of old ships built for the War, and is now turning every scrap of them into automobiles. This comes pretty near to being a fulfillment of the prophecy about beating our "swords into plough-shares" and our "spears into pruning hooks."

J. H. H.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

I.

I heard Annie Besant twice last week. The Theatre each time was not more then half full, partly because of the high price of admission. When she spoke of Krishnamurti she passed into the realm of the unproved, real or fantastic—who knows? I thought of Oliver Lodge when I listened. They are both great personalities with much of human service to their credit and one listens with great respect. If what they say is actually true, you have no objection. But the mind passes on with something of a smile, with the thought that probably their minds have been tricked by seeming. But, who knows? Young Krishnamurti has not yet said much that is startling and his preachment has been along the line of criticism of the materialism of the West, which even the Archbishop of Canterbury senses.

I was much more interested in what Mrs. Besant had to say about the freedom of India. She was appealing to America, which nation, said she, is the only nation on earth, to which Britain pays the slightest attention. Britain certainly came in for a trimming at her hands. It was really a fine example of the toleration existing in the British Empire that permits one of her subjects to roam around the earth uttering such sentiments that fell from Mrs. Besant's lips. Here are some of them:

India is suffering under a foreign yoke, and this should not be forgotten by Americans who threw off the British yoke in 1776. If India were free, as Canada and Australia are free, it would be better for both Britain and India. . . . India was for 5,000 years rich, happy and prosperous. . . . All this changed with the coming of the British, who have been efficient in the building of roads and in some industrial things, but shamefully deficient in the vital things that concern the life of a people.

For example, in matters of education. For many centuries, India had great universities and a village education which made the people intelligent, an education fitted to their own life. In the universities, it was plain food, hard living and hard study. With the coming of the British, this system of education disappeared. Today, less than 4 per cent of the people have a primary education. . . . Yet, the people have a passion for knowledge. This can never be satisfied in a country ruled by foreigners. Indians go in for brains more than for buildings, for teachers more than for apparatus.

As for poverty, India scarcely knew what it was before the British came. Poverty is now appalling. Sixty per cent of the people have less than the minimum required for decency. . . . The East India Company divided the people, set one portion over against another, until all India weakened by civil wars came under the British yoke. Then came the great war. Indians by the thousands gave their lives in Europe to save Britain. They were promised liberty, but they were deceived. They are declaring, "If we were good enough to die in the trenches for liberty, we are good enough to share this freedom."

Mrs. Besant's appeal to America for "my people" was extremely affecting. It was a good illustration of the way the peoples of the earth will seek more and more the sympathy of the big republic. It was dramatic, to see this powerful woman, over eighty, daughter of Britain, who had become identified with a subject people, as "her people" pleading with America to speak aloud to Britain, her older sister, to "let my people go." Truly, a great age, and no one need dispair of humanity.

II.

I recently heard U. S. Senator C. C. Dill on the subject of capital and labor in America. In the midst of millionaire-senators he is comparatively poor and democratic. What he had to say gives a fair picture of one phase of American life. He believes that employers and workers in America are nearer to common ground than ever in the history of the country. "Enlightened employers" he said "are no longer concerned about high wages. All they want is big production. Workers, too, have changed their attitude toward production. They think that if they are to receive high wages they must increase production. In America, as a result of shorter hours, better wages and universal education, two popular fallacies have been removed. The first is that the poor and ignorant love shacks and tenements, prefer cheap food and desire to remain ignorant. The second is that old things are sacred because they are old and new things dangerous because they are new. Science and invention have raised the labor standard as well as the worker. Modern machinery in America now does the work it would formerly require three billion slaves to do. The average American worker, in some measure, belongs to a "leisure class" such as only a privileged few formerly enjoyed. There is a distinct movement, Senator Dill thought, toward industrial democracy, as exemplified in labor banks, co-operation in management, bonus system and employe ownership.

I think there is no doubt that employers and workers are nearer to a common ground than ever. It is hardly in the direction of socialism, rather in the direction of benevolent capitalism. It is accepted as "bad business to be unfair to the workers." Many employers make distinct effort to socialize their own industry. This is in the age of experimentation. Whether this kind of system will stand the strain of "bad weather," one can but guess. Prosperity now obtains. I have a friend who gives every Monday morning a twenty minutes' talk to the 60 workers of a print shop—on the employer's time. He will speak of social, political, scientific themes, devoid of propaganda. This is but a straw in American industry, showing the direction of the wind. Employers in America—not the unions—have the main hand in directing the socialization of industry—all that takes place.

Big business men are also taking a distinct hand in the control of the benevolences of the country. The work of the great Foundations, like the Rockefeller, the Carnegie, the Russell Sage, is well known through-

out the world. Quite recently, fourteen millionaires of San Francisco made a "combine for charity." They are well-known bankers, merchants, manufacturers, etc. who are seeking to co-operate to spend their surplus wealth, while they live and under their own eyes. This marks a tendency. Who knows, the "rich man" may lead the world into the kingdom of God. At any rate, he is the only one in America who is doing much in that direction. A serial is now running in Hearst's newspapers in which it is contended that the real Jesus was a red-blooded business man with a genius for organization. The "lamb" idea of Jesus is untrue. He, Jesus, was a man of muscle. He was the founder of modern business. This will be pleasant reading, of course, to Dives and the "rich young ruler." One is led to inquire if the reason these two rich men, of the Gospel-story, failed was because they hadn't got on to Jesus' system of business. The words, "big business in charity" describe a prominent tendency in American life.

III

Now comes Rev. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, speaking about America's religious life, stating that the "churches are grappling courageously with great social and international questions; that there is decided progress in church federation; that there is today a return to a weightier emphasis on the inner life." He does not give many illustrations of his contention. Here comes Rev. Dr. Chauncey J. Hawkins, a leading Congregational clergyman of the Pacific Coast, saying that the military spirit is growing in the United States, that the social gospel is not preached much and is not liked by the pew when it is preached, with definite application. He said that once when he gave a sermon on Child Labor, a member immediately cut off three hundred dollars from the church's income. On another occasion, a sermon on social reform cost the church-treasury six hundred dollars. Whether the pulpit of America is also feeling a big-business hint, to "stick to the gospel" is worth investigating. It probably is. The owner and managerial class composes the strength of Protestantism. Why should the preachers give a gospel that too much contradicts the system of business that obtains. Preachers in America are easily falling back into the belief that their business is to proclaim the principles of the Gospel and let their laymen go forth and work out the principles! But as Dr. Hawkins asked, "Shall I say nothing about the brotherhood of race, when a Japanese Congregational pastor, from Tokyo, comes to my church and with glowing face refers to it as his "mother-church"—shall I say nothing about the Exclusion law? I should feel like a hypocrite, if I didn't."

Dr. Hawkins sustains a Question Box, every Sunday night. Here is a list of questions for last week. They will throw light on what some Americans are thinking about:

1. What are your views on the religious trouble between the Roman Church and the Mexican Government?

2. Do you approve of the Orting minister, arming himself with a loaded revolver, and joining a posse in pursuit of bootleggers?

3. How can we help people who are clamoring for a world teacher?

4. Do you think the Bible should be studied in the public schools?

5. Why is it so many ministers are not willing to give laymen a right to their own views or opinions of Christianity?

6. What is to become of the small church in the city?

7. What is the modernist's interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies? Do you consider them divine revelations? If not, how have they been so marvellously fulfilled?

Do you believe in capital punishment?

IV

America is made up of many races. Shem, Ham and Japhet each has many descendants. A hundred per cent American is found to be 15 per cent Ham, 2 per cent Shem, with all the colors of the rainbow under Japhet. If America could solve her race problem, the world could do it also. There are many efforts being made. There are the Howells, for example, in New York (89 Bedford St.), who organize "Reconciliation Trips" which means parties that visit different racial and industrial groups, of the big metropolis. One of the livest and most common topics at the summer schools and camps is the inter-racial problem. I have been invited to go tonight to an Inter-racial Concert, in which Negroes, Japanese, Filipinoes, Chinese, Hawaiians, Europeans, etc., will participate. It will be held in an African Methodist Church. Such concerts are getting popular. Before me is the Bulletin of the Council of International Relations, in Los Angeles, David Starr Jordan is president, while K. S. Beam, son of a distinguished American missionary in Japan is the secretary. The leading event of this week is a "Festival of Nations" in which is given all the nationalities in Los Angeles a chance to express themselves, "their culture, their achievements," etc. There is a myriad of efforts springing up in different parts of the land. I recently attended a conference on "The Brotherhood of Races" held all day at the sea-side. In one group of ten or twelve that happened to be standing on a huge log I noted a Lithuanian, a German, a Scotchman, a Negro, a Japanese, a French woman, a Jew, a Filipino, a Bulgarian—while one broad smile covered them all. And this group was not staged. Over a hundred were at the conference. They ate together, each opening up his basket-luncheon and sharing with the others. They built bonfires together, and coming home on the boat they sang together, the Negroes here easily proving themselves the "superior" race. There was a three-hour discussion, under the maples, of the basis of the brotherhood of races. The talk was all simple and direct. Several brought out the fact that men everywhere emphasize too much the differences instead of noting the similarities. As Jew, Japanese, Lithuanian, Filipino, Negro, German, American, Frenchman and Scotchman took part in the discussion freely and fearlessly, no one would have had the audacity to question the unity of the human race, and to have suggested the superiority of any one race would have been unthinkable. Such a suggestion would have choked in such an atmosphere. The presence of all races makes America an interesting land, and her future important.

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1926)

PART II—CHAPTER V

Preparing for South Africa

I was no doubt at fault in having gone to that officer. But his impatience and overbearing anger were out of all proportion to my mistake. It did not warrant expulsion. I can scarcely have taken up more than five minutes of his time. But he simply could not endure my talking. He could have politely asked me to go, but power had intoxicated him to an inordinate extent. Later I came to know that patience was not one of the virtues of this officer. It was usual for him to insult his visitors. The slightest unpleasantness was sure to put the *sahib* out.

Now most of my work would naturally be in his court. It was beyond me to conciliate him. I had no desire to curry favor with him. Indeed having once threatened to proceed against him, I did not like to remain silent.

Meanwhile I began to learn something of the petty politics of the country. Kathiawad being a conglomeration of small States, naturally had its rich crop of politicals. Petty intrigues between States and intrigues of officers for power were the order of the day. Princes were always at the mercy of others and ready to lend their ears to sycophants. Even the *sahib's* peon had to be cajoled, and the *sahib's Sheristedar* was more than his master, as he was his eyes, ears and his interpreter. The *Sheristedar's* will was law, and his income was always reputed to be more than the *sahib's*. This may have been an exaggeration, but he certainly lived beyond his salary.

This atmosphere appeared to me to be poisonous, and how to remain unscathed was a perpetual problem for me.

I was thoroughly depressed and my brother clearly saw it. We both felt that if I could secure a job somewhere I should be free from this atmosphere of intrigue. But without intrigue a ministership or judgeship was out of the question. And the quarrel with the *sahib* stood in the way of my practice.

Porbander was then under administration, and I had some work there in the shape of securing more powers for the prince. Also I had to see the Administrator in respect of the heavy *vighoti* (rent) exacted from the Mers. This officer, though an Indian, was, I found, one better than the *sahib* in arrogance. He was able, but the ryots appeared to me to be none the better off for his ability. I succeeded in securing a few more powers for the Rana, but hardly any relief for the Mers. It struck me that their cause was not carefully gone into.

So even in this mission I was comparatively disappointed. I thought justice was not done to the clients and I had not the means to secure it. At the most I could have appealed to the Political Agent or to the Governor who would have dismissed the appeal saying, " we decline to interfere." If there had been any rule or regulation governing such decisions, it would have been something; but here the *sahib's* will was law.

I was exasperated.

Meantime a Memon firm from Porbander wrote to my brother making the following offer: "We have business in South Africa. Ours is a big firm, and we have a big case there in the Court, our claim being £40,000. It has been going on for a long time. We have the services of the best Vakils and barristers. If you sent your brother there he would be useful to us and also to himself. He would be able to explain our case better to our counsel. He would have the advantage of seeing a new part of the world, and of making new acquaintances."

My brother discussed the proposition with me. I could not clearly make out whether I had simply to explain the case to the counsel or to appear in Court. But I was tempted.

My brother introduced me to the late Seth Abdul Kareem Jhaveri, a partner of Dada Abdulla and Co., the firm in question. "It won't be a difficult job," the Seth assured me. "We have big Europeans as our friends, whose acquaintance you will make. You can be useful to us in our shop. Much of our correspondence is in English and you can help us in that too. You will, of course, be our guest and hence will have no expense whatever."

"How long do you require my services?" I asked. "And what will be the payment?"

"Not more than a year. We will pay you a first-class return fare and a sum of £105, all found."

This was hardly going there as a barrister. It was going as a servant of the firm. But I wanted somehow to leave India. There was as well the temptation of seeing a new country, and of having new experience. Also I could send £ 105 to my brother and help in the expenses of the household. I closed with the offer, without any higgling, and got ready to go to South Africa.

M. K. GANDHI.

(Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.)

Sonnet

Written after hearing the "Marche Slav" of Tchaikovsky

The massive battle surge has swept me by
Its sanguine lines through the cruel blindness
Of unthinking sorrow. I saw hopeless,
Bound in chains, the enslaved of war who die
A thousand deaths in mute captivity.
I saw the liberated in the dead
Who sank with dear bought freedom from the red
Groans of the conquered in their agony.

I felt the blue-gray fog of peace descend
Upon black chaos and dumb ruin. The
Heart of a people lay by hate subdued
To cold servility. We seek to mend
War's ravages by making slave men free
And freemen slaves, with bitterness imbued.

LILIAN KUENSTER.

Hinduism and Christianity

May the God Almighty protect us together. May He foster us together. Let us strive heroically. Let that which we learn be full of meaning. And let us not hate each other. Peace! Peace!! Peace!!!

—*A Hindu Prayer.*

There is no denying the fact that the American public has very funny notions about India even as we Hindus have equally funny notions about this great democracy. The belief of the average American about India is that the people of our country are magicians well versed in Oriental witchcraft and trickery, that they are orthodox in the extreme, that they throw their babies in the Ganges and burn their widows alive. I will leave you to judge for yourself how far these statements are true from the following discourse on the religion of the Hindus. It seems to me that the misunderstanding prevailing in this country about India is due to misconceived notions western travellers get from a cursory glance at Indian life. I myself had acquired funny ideas about this country before I came here and stayed long enough to understand America, not by noticing the number of divorce cases, murders, crimes, immoralities and what not, but by trying to interpret sympathetically the crude yet sincere efforts made by this young country to maintain world-peace, to obliterate illiteracy, and to spread the idea of democracy.

We must not forget that Hinduism is not a religion founded by A, B, or C, but it is a philosophy of life based upon the experiences of hundreds and thousands of people who were looking after truth, and is nearly five thousand years old.

These sages, known as *Risnis,* wrote down their experiences one after the other and the book containing their writings is called the Vedas. It is not the property of one man. In fact, the Vedas say that they are without beginning and without end. This might sound paradoxical, but a little thought will show us how simple the statement is. Did not the law of gravitation exist before Newton found it? Has the law of gravitation any beginning or any end? It had been there long before Newton found it and it will be there long after we forget it again. That law, like many other laws, has no beginning and no end and will always exist no matter whether we know about its existence or not. So also, the Vedanta philosophy has no beginning and no end and we do not care to know who are the several authors of the Vedas. What does it matter? All we want to know is, "What do these Vedas, over four thousand years old, teach us?"

India is peculiar in that a diversity of beliefs is tolerated by Hindu scriptures and practiced by the followers. From the extreme atheists to the vulgar idolators, every one will find a place in India. That is why you will not find religious wars of consequence in the whole history of India.

It is impossibe to do justice to this subject in this short space. However, I can show you a few glimpses of the philosophy of the Hindus which attracted the attention of great western scholars like Max Muller, Edward Carpenter, Romain Rolland, H. G. Wells and others.

When I say *I* am giving a lecture, whom do I mean by *"I"?* Does this *"I"* mean my mouth or face or brain or my whole body? It cannot be so, for, when I die, all these are left behind and still *I* am not there.

This "I," says the Vedas, is nothing but the voice of God within us. *This "I"* is the soul. *This "I" or soul* is *not* created, for if it were, it would be destructible, as all creations are. Again, if we believe God created this soul, we will be saying God is partial, because we find some souls in good bodies and good surroundings, while others in quite the reverse positions. So the soul, like the God Almighty, is *not* created. It is nothing but a part of the God Almighty.

You will ask me then why the soul is suffering in this world. Why this misery and unrest? The answer to this is very simple. It is suffering because of our ignorance. It is under self-delusion. Half of our miseries are due to nothing but our impotency to see our own capacities and to raise ourselves to the height of the occasion. As Carlyle says, Belief is great, Belief is all-powerful. On the other hand we know that want of belief and realization of our real worth are a great handicap to our progress. We have enough historical data to prove this contention. Therefore, says the Vedanta, realize, brothers and sisters, that "the Kingdom of God is within us." Once we find out this truth, we will find heaven on this earth. Once we realize the fact that the soul within A and the soul within B, our own soul, and the souls of all other people, are nothing but parts of the Almighty God, all hatred will disappear. We don't hate our hand because it is broken. No matter what kind of limbs we have, we love them. Similarly then, we will love humanity if we once realize that we are all but children of God and by hurting anyone we are hurting ourselves.

I realize that this is a very difficult task to accomplish, but I hope you will agree with me when I say that it is a worthwhile task anyway. The more difficult the task, the stronger the pleasure we must find in its accomplishment. That is the teaching of the Vedas in a nutshell. It goes on describing the various means by which we *can* accomplish this end, into the details of which I cannot go here.

I would like to write a few words about the much misunderstood idolatry of India. It is wrong to suppose that India is polytheistic. Examine any prayer, whether addressed to the sun or the moon or the stars or the various idols, and you will find one idea running through it, namely, the oneness of God. These are addressed to the God of Gods, who is *one.* But since it is so hard to visualize this Unknown, Unseen, and All-powerful, Almighty, the Hindu philosophy has three modes of worship. First is the simple common way, and that is material worship. Since God is everywhere, even according to the Bible, what difference does it make if you worship him through the sun, or the moon, or a common ten cent idol? Besides, do not we do the same thing here when we go to a grave and offer

flowers? Why are we so anxious to have pictures of all those whom we love around us? It is because the human mind needs concrete forms for visualization, even though we have seen them in living form. How much more difficult it is to make an attempt to visualize God whom we have never seen! The second mode of worship is by mental pictures as Christians do in our churches. The last and the highest stage is the actual visualization of God within us and we within Him, i. e., the grasping of the fundamental truth that all of us are nothing but the manifestations of the Almighty God, no matter whether we try to see him through the Koran of the Mohamedans, or the Bible of the Christians, or the Gita and the Vedas of the Hindus and so on.

It would be interesting for you to note that even Jesus offers a different kind of philosophy to different classes of people. Thus in the common prayer we find "Our Father who art in heaven, etc." Now, we know that heaven is not any material object and yet we have the habit of instinctively lifting our faces upward. To more intelligent adherents of Jesus He says: "For, as I am in Thee, and ye in me, so we are all one in the Father." Going still farther we find some astounding statements made by this prophet. When accused by the Jews he was asked "Who art thou?", to which he replied, "I and my Father are one." Astounded at this apparent impudence, the Jews asked him what he meant, to which he replied in his characteristically sincere, open-minded manner, "Know ye not that ye are Gods?" This is nothing but what the Vedanta philosophy has been saying. In fact, India welcomed the message of Jesus long ago. Gandhi, Tagore and hundreds of others in India, will always bow their heads in reverence for Christ as they do for the Buddha and Shri Krishna. We are not interested in Jesus, the man, and what he did, but *we are* interested in his philosophy and what he taught. We don't worry over whether Jesus was a fictitious figure or not. Supposing that he was, what does it matter? The philosophy attributed to him will remain there just the same even as the rose will smell as sweet if called by another name. That is India's attitude towards truth; that has been her attitude all the time. "Love," "Tolerance" and "live and let live" have been her mottoes instead of "hatred," "intolerance" and "survival of the fittest." Such being the basis of our civilization, it is not dead and will not die even though we have been under the domination of two different civilizations, the Mohamedan and the Christian. The Empires of Rome and Greece came and went, and the Empires of Great Britain, Germany, France, and America have come and will go. But, like the law of gravitation, the teachings of great prophets will live for eternity. They have no beginning, no end. Whether one follows Jesus, or Buddha, or Shri Krishna, one will reach the same goal even as all rivers ultimately reach the seas, which are all connected one with the other. All we need to do is to be more honest and sincere in our beliefs and follow them, even outside the church, in every way and on every day of our lives. This is India's message to any one who cares to hearken to it. Let me put it before you through the words of Poet Tagore:

> I am India. . . . I have my flaws and blemishes. . . . My garments are dirty, and my feet are bleeding with thorns. . . . The gift that I proudly bring to you is the heart of a woman. Here have all pains and joys gathered the hopes and fears and shames of the daughters of the dust; here love springs up struggling toward immortal life.

As Gandhi says, "We are all imperfect specimens of humanity, but it is our duty to strive onward and reach the ideal." Let us then, as the Hindu prayer says at the beginning, strive heroically and learn not to hate each other.

Beacon, N. Y. V. V. Oak.

*Mr. Oak is a Hindu philosopher traveling in this country.

Early Autumn

It is dark and threatening and the north wind scuttles about the cottage. One hears only the sound of the axe falling upon the roots of the dying oak trees, or the thud of the tree as it strikes the ground, or the acorns falling in showers. Twenty trees, or more, are now paying the penalty of a fire of six years ago. How pathetic to see these virgin trees wither and die!

Two months ago a tragedy occurred. A perfectly healthy-looking oak, tall and slender, its top heavy with glistening leaves, broke at the base, in a storm, and fell across the drive. Sad enough it was to lose our old friend, but when we discovered an oriole's nest in a branch, with four tiny unfeathered birds, we were dismayed. One, which had fallen from the nest, I replaced as gently as possible. For hours the parent birds flew back and forth, as if in a daze, over the spot where the nest had swung in the oak. They rested occasionally in a low locust just above the nest in the prostrate tree, but they either did not see the nest, or would not return to it. About sundown, I cut the branch from the oak and tied it on to the locust in plain view. The nestlings were still alive, but looked more like crabs than birds. The orioles paid no attention to it, but we hoped that they would return when all was quiet in the evening. However, morning found the nest deserted and the little birds dead.

But there are comedies always intermingled with the tragedies of life. One large spreading oak needed trimming. When the man had mounted to the branches and commenced sawing, an angry squirrel appeared above his head and chattered angrily. The woodman soon discovered the squirrel's nest, made of leaves and small branches, built on a big limb close to the trunk of the tree. I heard him muttering—

> "Naw, I ain't a goin' to hurt ye, nor yer nest nuther—no, nor yer young uns. Just take it easy. I'll soon be gone, an' leave ye in peace."

But in the tree the squirrel remained, scolding the intruder and creeping back into the nest every time a little head appeared over the top. At noon the woodman said—

> "There, I'm a goin' to leave ye in peace while I eat my dinner, and ye can go and get some dinner for yerself an' yer young uns. I'll be back, but I won't hurt ye."

When he returned, to the tree, an hour later, I heard—

> "Well, I declare! Where be ye? Gone, every darned one

of ye's! Whar' ye gone to, I'd like to know. Them young uns pretty little to be moved, Ish'd think. Hope they didn't fall out an' get hurted. I'll see,"
and down he climbed and looked all about the ground.

"Well, I'll be darned," he exclaimed, scratched his head and slowly mounted.

I could have relieved his bewilderment for, just before my lunch time, the mother squirrel crept softly along the lawn, through the garden, with one of her young in her mouth, and disappeared in the tall grass. I watched carefully, but did not see her return to her nest. It must have been the last one which I saw her transferring to the new home.

How curious I was, concerning this new home! But it was a long time before I discovered it. Often a red squirrel would dash across the lawn or climb a tree close by and I always wondered if this were *the* squirrel.

One day I happened to be looking at an oak which had daubs of red paint upon it where branches had been cut. A large squirrel appeared on one of the branches. Back and forth it moved in a most unusual way. Finally, a little one crept timidly toward the mother. Another followed—and another, until there were four. For a fortnight they have been playing about the branches of this tree. Often it is their chattering that attracts our attention. Now the little ones venture on to the swaying branches to gather acorns for themselves, but they, apparently, have not ventured down. The mother is kept busy foraging when she is not playing with the young—or perhaps, she is teaching them, and they, and I think it is only play. She returns to the tree again and again, her pouches filled with acorns or hickory nuts, which are now commencing to fall. Even an ear of corn she does not disdain, and it is a laughable sight when she climbs with an ear almost as big as herself in her mouth. At each branch she stops and transfers the corn from her mouth to her paws and takes a well-earned rest. Before she reaches the nest, four frisky little squirrels are dancing about, whisking their tails and literally licking their chops. Then one hears only the munching and sees only the tails waving like plumes.

A saucy red-headed woodpecker delights in tormenting the squirrels. He comes every day, perches himself close by the young ones and commences scolding, often varying it by making rapid flights toward them. They don't seem to like it and usually scurry back into their nest, but if Mrs. Squirrel returns while Mr. Woodpecker is there, there occurs a noisy fight, but its *words, all words.*

One day, a little one, more venturesome than the rest, fell to the ground—perhaps through fright of the woodpecker. The mother squirrel happened to be there and there was such a mad scramble down the trunk of that tree that she had difficulty in keeping her footing, and almost somersaulted to the ground. But the little one was unhurt and Mother Squirrel soon carried her in her mouth, back to safety.

Our autumn months will be enlivened by watching the antics of these four-footed friends. I shall be sorry when the little ones can go hurrying off by themselves.

In front of my window a tall oak lies prostrate and is rapidly being made into fire-wood. On this was a bird-box, tenanted earlier in the season by bluebirds. How the chipmunks delighted to climb to the top of this house, lean over and peer down at the door and how angrily the birds would scold him and even attack him until he retreated! One day, I watched a squirrel climb an apple tree and descend with a small apple between his teeth. At the base, he transferred the apple to his paws, sat on his haunches, and looked about. Believing himself unobserved, he scampered across the lawn to this oak and climbed on to the top of the now-deserted bird house. There he left the apple gleaming red against the black bark. Two days passed before he returned and took it away.

Our woodman is observant, and a bit of a philosopher, as all who come into direct contact with nature, must be. Of late the woodpeckers have been making such a racket—boring and uttering shrill cries.

"Ye wouldn't believe," said the woodman, "how industreeous them woodpeckers be. And they don't like me at all. Why I find the most cur'us things in them trees, when I'm 'way up there choppin' and sawin' away. Some o' them holler limbs is plum full o' acorns that the woodpeckers hid there, and then the racket they make when they see the limb fall! Sh'd think they would! But when they get dun scoldin' they fly down to the groun' and pick up them acorns—every one. An' the squirrels too! They do a lot o' harm to the trees. Why I seen many a limb girdled from the squirrels' teeth. But they are purty critters. I dunno as I'd get rid of them if I could."

I'm always interested when a person talks about things he understands. I suppose the woodman felt encouraged for he paused, with one foot on the ladder, and then continued,

"Ye know that big tree up by the bend in the road—the dead one that we wanted to take down? Well, would ye believe it, that tree's full of bees? Yes, a whole army of 'em, I clim up and looked at 'em, but I clim down quickern I went up. Then I watched 'em crawlin' on the tree an' goin' in an' out of their hive. Funny, ain't it, how things c'n be right afore yer eyes and ye never see them? Then when ye do see 'em, ye jest wonder how ye c'd a been so blind. Guess we'll have to wait till winter when them bees is all asleep in their hives afore we cut down that tree!"

With a chuckle he climbed the tree and left me to my thoughts.

Already I have visualized a mountain ash growing where the oak so lately stood. When the other fruits and berries have disappeared, the wax wings and chick-a-dees will feast here and keep us interested. And below, shall stand three cherry trees—two for the birds and one for us. And over their blossoming tops, I shall have a view of the glistening lake, which changes at every whim of wind, sun, cloud or rain.

H. S. N.

IN A MOUNTAIN FOREST

Majestic maze
Of saintly loveliness!
How every tree
With steadfast skyward gaze
And unremitting toil
Soars to its beatific vision,
Sinking with each aspiring upward urge,
Its roots still deeper in the fostering soil.

Here, on this scarred, gray-gleaming trunk
Still dimly glows
An acient blaze,
Which shows
That other feet have passed.
Who knows?
Perchance some questing soul,
Treading these very leaves
In ecstacy like mine.
Has known the bliss
Of rendering in utter selflessness
All that he is
Unto the soul divine!

DOMBEY SHEPHERD.

Bearing One Another's Burdens

[A Suggestion on the Debt Problem]

American policy towards her European debtors has become a matter of inevitable and irrepressible importance. It is one which intimately concerns "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor," and our sense of obligation to those of our nation's youth from whom the President and the law demanded the last, full measure of devotion. It is altogether proper, therefore, for public men, charged with a sense of public responsibility, and particularly such a man as Newton D. Baker who was a member of the Government which contracted the loans and conducted the war, to express opinion and conviction upon a subject of such importance. We do not hesitate to declare our hope and belief that the discussion of this issue will find a place, and perhaps a chief place, in the next presidential campaign. Nothing would more effectively conduce to popular interest and education concerning our responsibilities in foreign affairs than such a discussion, and nothing could be more regrettable than that American policy towards the settlement of the war-debts should be determined without public interest or debate by private conferences of bankers or politicians, of whatever experience or reputation.

We believe, however, that it would be very unfortunate if the coming debate should turn upon the alternative of a choice between a policy of cancellation versus one of funding and partial repayment for that would be an over-simplification and even a distortion of the facts, because it would by no means exhaust the practicable measures open to courageous and constructive American statesmanship.

We do not share the expressed conviction of your contemptuous contemporary, the New York *Herald-Tribune*, that the all-important consideration is the maintenance of international financial integrity by a policy demanding that there shall be full acknowledgment of the obligation to pay, even if payment in full is impossible or undesirable. Such a position savors of the pharisaical, for there is a moral integrity involved which is certainly more compelling than any fiduciary considerations. If it be in fact true that no strictly business-like solution of a vast and complicated international debt, involving ardent sentiments and sensitive *amour-propre*, is possible,—a debt, it must be remembered, contracted by the Allied governments under the extreme exigency of a life and death struggle, and extended, on our part, in anything but a narrow, profit-seeking business spirit; and if, likewise, it be true that what may seem to us to be but the justifiable insistence of an injured creditor, appears to others—in view of their heavier sacrifices and of the fact that the monies loaned were chiefly spent for purchases of American goods from American firms in the United States—to be the menacing demands of a hard-fisted usurer who owes allegiance to no other god than his own prosperity, and who is bent upon achieving economic overlordship of the world by reducing other nations to the status of a gigantic fief; if all this be even approximately true, then it is high time that American statesmanship and American public opinion should face the problem of making a new orientation of policy and of finding a new and more adequate solution than that supposed to lie in the funding on unequal terms of separately unpayable debts.

We are not disposed to accept the idea of mutual cancellation in an international conference as the wisest or even the most practicable. We doubt its fairness. We are by no means certain that coming generations of young Germans can be or ought to be saddled with an uncalculated debt based upon the increasingly untenable theory that certain of their ancestors were solely responsible for the infinite tragedy of the World War, as stipulated in paragraph 231 of the Treaty of Versailles. We are entirely certain that American taxpayers of today and tomorrow ought not to be asked to assume the great economic hardship of footing a large part of the cost of that war for the origin of which we cannot even be charged with responsibility. We believe firmly that the burden of paying for the war should be equitably distributed among all the nations that participated in the war. How that desirable end would be achieved by cancellation we do not yet see, so long as the American government must go on raising the money with which to pay off its bonded indebtedness incurred in order to advance the loans to the erstwhile Allies. If this be victory, words have lost their meaning and defeat and bankruptcy are relatively acceptable!

It seems more reasonable to us that an equitable distribution of the burden would far more nearly be achieved, together with restoration of the gold standard and of stability for the bankrupt states, by reciprocal agreements to scale down equally the rates of interest upon all the outstanding and unpaid war-indebtednesses, whether the bonds are held by nationals of the debtor states or by foreign governments or citizens. Such a policy, we have reason to believe, would solve the domestic fiscal problems of the bankrupt states in a few years, and make international payments possible. It would not, moreover, be confiscatory as was that of inflation pursued by the German government to the point of ruin of the established currency and of social chaos and demoralization, and pursued to a less extreme conclusion by all the European belligerent states. It might well be accompanied by a careful study of Mr. Frank Vanderlip's challenging proposal, made at the Genoa conference, in 1922, for creation of an international currency guaranteed by German reparations-bonds, which might never need to be paid. Such a currency would greatly facilitate international trade and thus promote prosperity more surely than the payment of uncertain debts in unwelcome gold, were payment possible.

But whether or not these or other possible solutions commend themselves to the wise and the far-sighted, we submit that the problem is a world problem which American statesmanship is now compelled to approach from more than a provincial and self-righteous point-of-view. Until it is solved, and rightly solved, Mr. Baker and others are fully justified in warning us against the manifest dangers of increasing bitterness and hostility which is bad for business and unpropitious for peace.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

In Reply to Mr. Chworowsky

I

Editor of UNITY:

I am positively indignant at your correspondent who refers to you with such contemptible epithets as "superciliousness" and "intolerance."

These spring from ignorance of the Prohibition question. Allow me to tell him that if all the buyers, dope importers, anti-Prohibition advocates were suddenly arrested and deported, America, which is dry by national consent, would be purged of many undesirables.

Glens Falls, N. Y. L. P. JUVET.

II.

Editor of UNITY:

Noting Mr. Chworowsky's letter in your issue of Sept. 20th, it occurs to me that I might possibly "dip into" this matter and perhaps suggest a thought which I have not seen expressed in your paper on the subject of Prohibition.

Perhaps I might, reasonably, be accused of what Mr. Chworowsky calls "superciliousness and intolerance" were I to discuss the question of the use of liquor, for I should share your views as to the evils of intemperance and also as to the baneful effects of the so-called business in a community; but, without discussing the merits of the case, let me say to start with, that the subject of Prohibition is much misunderstood by the average person. The idea, as conceived by the Prohibition Party, when they presented the case as a political issue, was based upon the facts, first, that the organized liquor traffic was the most powerful political force in America; 2nd, that to engage in the traffic was not an inherent right but rather a special privilege; and 3rd, that the movement was designed "to protect the country from the evil effects of a (recognized) commercial business" which was a burden to tax-payers and hence a mighty poor business proposition for Uncle Sam. In other words, while the government collected a tax from one going into the "business," it then assumed the enormous expense of taking care of the "products" of the "business" by virtue of the necessity of so many penal institutions, courts, etc., etc., to care for the victims. It has been estimated, on this basis, that whereas Uncle Sam (under the license policy) collected $1.00, he turned around and spent $10.00 for the expenses of the privilege granted for the $1.00.

Many persons believe Prohibition to be a scheme to "save people from the disastrous consequences of indulgence in alcoholic beverages." Not so!!!

Let me quote from one of their platforms (which happens to be handy): "The alcoholic drink traffic is wrong; is the most serious drain on the wealth and resources of the nation; is detrimental to the general welfare and destructive of the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. All laws taxing or licensing a traffic which produces crime, poverty and political corruption and spreads disease and death, should be repealed. To destroy such a traffic there must be elected to power a political party which will administer the government from the standpoint that the alcoholic drink traffic is a crime and not a business, and we pledge that the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation and sale of alcoholic beverages shall be prohibited."

Now then, since ours is a government of political parties and no man, no matter how "good" he may be—no matter how much of an anti-liquor man he may be—is any better, *politically* than his party and since his party is no better than the worst interest it must serve in order to carry an election, and, since both the dominant parties must cater to both the "dry" and the "wet" vote, it follows that not much sympathy can be given to the enforcement of the 18th amendment by either of them. In fact, this is true with *all* parties save only the Prohibition party which (no matter what *else* it stands for) stands for the enforcement of Prohibition.

Hence, if we want prohibition, vote for the Prohibition Party candidates, for non-partisan prohibition is largely a farce and, as I see it, can hardly be expected to be anything else.

In short, the question is one of administration more than of legislation.

In all fairness, however, to the present type of non-partisan Prohibition which we have, it should be recalled that it was only adopted after efforts to avert the evil effects of the "business" (without molesting the personal use of liquor) had been made by means of regulation and had failed through the disregard, by the liquor traffic itself, of the regulative laws.

For years I supported the Prohibition party because I believed the liquor question to be the most important question calling for solution, and whereas, today, I despise the liquor traffic as much as ever, yet I hate the muzzling of free men and the wholesale murder of human beings under the guise of an honorable system ("War") more. Therefore, I feel that I must be content to subordinate the liquor question to what seems to me to be, the more important questions before the American people, namely the maintenance of free speech and the outlawry of war.

I am living in the hope that, some day, the Prohibition, or some other political party, may declare for *all three* of these things which I think are so important.

Why not a party pledged to Outlawry and to the strict adherence to the Constitution of the U. S.—including the 1st, 15th and 18th Amendment, all so frequently "overlooked?" PARKER D. KING.

The Next Step Toward Peace

Editor of UNITY:

I submit a circular herewith* for publication in your paper if you deem it worthy. It is just off the press. I am sending it to a considerable number of papers. It is the outcome of a good deal of discussion among workers for peace as to the next thing to do, the thing on which all the peace societies can unite.

Please note that the proposal avoids the matters on which sincere peacemakers differ, such as the World Court and the League of Nations. It can not possibly be dismissed as visionary or impracticable, being the measure advocated by Chief Justice Taft when he was president. It must appeal to that important group which regards the outlawing of war as a primary need, as it shows that such outlawing can begin at once. The plea that good faith between nations should be taken for granted, and that no provision can wisely be made beforehand for cases of bad faith, is supported by the example of the framers of our federal system.

David Starr Jordan's definitions of wisdom and of virtue, quoted in the circular, are impressive. What is the thing to do next in the supremely important business of abolishing war? Can you answer the question better than it is answered in the circular?

Will you advocate an all-inclusive peace treaty between Great Britain and the United States as the first of a series of like treaties outlawing war between the high contracting parties?

HENRY W. PINKHAM,

Secretary, The Association to Abolish War, Brookline, Mass.

*See in "The Field" this week.—Editor.

Great Encouragement!

[From a personal letter]

". . . UNITY grows more and more necessary to my life. Each week brings something invaluable; and while I might—and often do—complain and criticize, I am always grateful. . . ." P.

A Card of Thanks

Editor of UNITY:

I thank you for having acquainted me with so wonderful a work as that carried on by Miss Strong in Russia. Thank you for your "ad" in UNITY which made me acquainted with the John Reed School.

And I am so glad that your paper is giving us the autobiography of Gandhi. I admire him greatly.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin. E. H.

The Field

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion."

THE NEXT THING TO DO

Will you enlist in a most hopeful Crusade?

The time is ripe to abolish war, and the present generation can do it.

Now is the Time!

Participation by the United States in the World War was plausibly defended by the plea that it was a war to end war. But war begets more war. Common sense, courage and good-will are necessary to end it.

The experience of 1914-18 affords a frightful exhibition of the futility of war and of its fearfully increasing costliness in life and wealth. The conviction grows everywhere that there must never again be such a war. While the nations are still recovering from the exhaustion of the World War, before the sense of its horror and waste and foolishness has faded away, peace must and can be established.

In the United States

Mr. Hughes, when Secretary of State, said: "So far as we can see into the future, we are safe from the slightest danger of aggression. We know that in no Power or possible combination of Powers lies any menace to our security. The peoples of the earth turn to us with good-will and desire our good-will in return."

The words are still true. Yet our government is spending from two to three times as much on preparation for war as it spent before the World War. Youth are being trained for war in summer camps and even in high schools and colleges in larger number than ever before in time of peace. Meanwhile the peacemakers fail to agree upon a single simple line of action.

In Europe

The Scandinavian nations and Switzerland and Holland are leading the world in making treaty engagements for peaceable settlement of every possible international dispute, and in reducing their armaments consistently with such treaties. The government of Denmark has even proposed complete self-disarmament, and the bill therefor has passed one house of the Danish parliament.

Great Britain has lately been deeply impressed by the Women Peacemakers' Pilgrimage. Representative women decided not only to talk for peace but also to walk for peace. Starting at different points, holding meetings in places through which they journeyed, finding a welcome everywhere, coming together at last with music and banners and pageantry for a great assemblage in Hyde Park, thousands of earnest women have given to the cause of peace a dramatic and colorful setting. The following resolution indicates their immediate aim:

"We, members and supporters of the Peacemakers' Pilgrimage, believing that law should take the place of war in the settlement of international disputes, urge his Majesty's Government to agree to settle all disputes by conciliation or arbitration, and by taking the lead in the proposed Disarmament Conference of the League of Nations, to show that Great Britain does not intend to appeal to force."

The Outlawing of War.

The latest effort of the peacemakers of the United States to find a basis for united action was in Chicago, June 10-11, when a widely representative conference adopted a series of resolutions giving first place to the outlawing of war "by making it a crime under the law of nations."

How shall war be outlawed? The third resolution adopted at Chicago contains a definite and practicable answer to this question. It calls attention to the all-inclusive peace treaties being made in Europe by which "more than one nation has agreed to submit every possible case of international dispute to its appropriate tribunal, not even reserving questions of national honor and vital interest," and it urges the government of the United States to make similar treaties.

These two things, namely, the outlawing of war and the making of treaties for the pacific settlement of all international disputes, are essentially one and the same. They should be held together in our minds. When any two countries make such a treaty with each other, war between those two countries is thereby made illegal. When all nations are mutually bound by a network of such treaties, the outlawing of war will be complete.

The more enlightened countries need not wait for their backward sisters. Every such agreement diminishes the area in which war is a legal procedure. There is therefore no need to wait for all or any of the governments of the earth explicitly and totally to repudiate the war system; no need to wait for the codification of international law, or for anything else. The outlawing of war is already taking place; our country can participate in the enterprise as soon as it pleases.

Say Nothing About War

In none of the comprehensive peace treaties lately made in Europe is war branded as a "crime." The treaties stipulate how various classes of disputes shall be settled peaceably and say nothing about war; they simply assume the good faith of the contracting parties. This is exactly what was done when our federal system was framed. Our Constitution provides for the pacific settlement of disputes between the States, and ignores the possibility that a State make war upon another. Both Hamilton and Madison maintained in the Convention of 1787 that the coercion of an entire population is unsound in principle. Accordingly our Constitution makes no provision for the coercion of a State by the general government.

The word "crime" is properly associated with policing. It is strictly applicable only to the act of an individual. A nation as such,—a population of men, women and children,—can not commit a crime except by a misleading figure of speech. Said Burke: "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment of a whole people."

Furthermore, war—collective homicide, as Novicow accurately defined it—is such suicidal folly that two governments, in providing for the peaceful settlement of all disputes between themselves, can not arrange for the contingency of war in violation of their agreement, without impugning their mutual respect. Surely war belongs to the category of those things which St. Paul called it "a shame even to speak of."

The Next Thing to Do

David Starr Jordan says that wisdom consists in knowing what to do next and virtue in doing it. The one simple thing to do next is to outlaw war between our country and every other country that is willing to accept our invitation to unite with us in doing it.

Denmark has declared its foreign policy thus: "If we have a conflict with any other state which we cannot solve by diplomatic negotiations, we shall submit it to arbitration." Let our government likewise declare it our policy to adopt conciliation, or adjudication, or arbitration—some peaceable procedure or other—rather than to go to war. Has not President Coolidge already virtually said as much? "Our country has definitely relinquished the old standard of dealing with other countries by terror and force and is definitely committed to the new standard of dealing with them through friendship and understanding." Let us affirm our readiness to put this policy into law by appropriate treaties.

If there are governments that we regard as especially unstable or untrustworthy, we may postpone our peace treaties with them. In general we shall do well to trust every nation that is willing to trust us. Grant the possibility that some country break its faith. In that case the situation must

The Community Pulpit

1926-1927

Twenty Printed Sermons

By John Haynes Holmes and John Herman Randall

As preached in The Community Church of New York.

$2, postpaid, for the series.

You are cordially invited to subscribe.

Address:

THE SECRETARY

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH

12 Park Avenue, New York City

be met with the utmost wisdom available at the time. It cannot be specifically provided for beforehand without inviting it. There is no practical alternative but to trust in the good faith of other nations. Let us be anxious only to keep faith ourselves.

WHERE SHALL WE BEGIN?

No two countries of the first rank have yet made an all-inclusive peace pact with each other. Suppose the most powerful two countries in the world should so agree—this would mark the greatest triumph of peace the world has seen. These two are the English-speaking peoples, Great Britain and the United States. If with their kindred institutions and common traditions they are not willing to outlaw war with each other, then indeed the prospect for peace is dark. But they are willing.

Such a treaty would only be putting into law what has actually been the procedure of the two countries for the past century and more, during which numerous disputes, some of them serious, have been settled by peaceful means. It would moreover only be the accomplishment of that which President Taft attempted in the Knox-Bryce Treaty which failed of ratification by the Senate. President Taft said in 1910:

"If now we can negotiate and put through a positive agreement with some great nation to abide the judication of an international arbitral court in every issue which cannot be settled by negotiation, no matter what it involves, whether honor, territory or money, we shall have made a long step forward by demonstrating that it is possible for two nations at least to establish as between them the same system of due process of law that exists between individuals under a government."

Send to the Association To Abolish War, 7 Wellington Terrace, Brookline, Mass., for copies of this in circular form for distribution; also for copies of Petition to the President.

TO VOTERS

To give victory to the right, no bloody bullets but peaceful ballots only are necessary. It only needs that a right thinking man shall go to the polls and without fear or prejudice, vote as he thinks.—Lincoln, *October 1, 1856.*

EXPENSE OF WAR PREPARATIONS

Great Britain, France and the United States are the three countries of the world which spend most per capita on war preparations, according to statistics recently made available by the League of Nations. Great Britain comes first with average annual appropriations, including military, naval and aerial, exceeding $518,000,000, or $12.96 per capita. France follows with $255,000,000, or $6.43 per capita and the United States is next with $554,000,000, or $4.94 per capita. After the United States comes Italy with an average annual expenditure on armaments of $156,000,000, or $3.86 per capita, and Japan is next with $219,000,000 or $3.68 per capita. Soviet Russia is found to spend least per capita of all the great powers on war preparations, with $191,000,000, or $1.45 per capita, falling even behind defeated Germany, whose armaments are strictly regulated at a minimum by treaty impositions after the war, and which now spends a total of $108,000,000 annually, or $1.70 per capita.—*The World Tomorrow.*

Sea Diamonds

The sun is raining diamonds down
Upon the sea; each dancing ripple
Has a glittering gem for crown.
Where will you find these jewels bright
When clouds the sun enfold?
Far at the rainbow's end they gleam
Beside the pot of gold!

MARGUERITE EMILIO.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel. Atlantic 1876

OCTOBER

Marks the possibility of real savings in Autumn and Winter wardrobes. For through the use of this Service many previously worn garments—of men, women and children—may be recovered to further usefulness and good appearance. Fine equipment, experience and skill combine towards making our cleansing so dependable.

Schumann & Co Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0281 ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS

3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Your health, and the health of your entire family will be benefited by a daily glass of

Bowman DAIRY COMPANY Milk!

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.